The Catechism and the Censor

The Two Operations of Information Control — Why a Person Decides Only on the Contents of Their Own Head, So That a Mind May Be Governed Either by Filling It or by Starving It; How the Inflow Valve of Formation Pours In the Authorized Story Before It Can Be Weighed, and the Outflow Valve of Suppression Keeps the Rival Story Out; Why a Durable Order Needs Both, the Catechism Leaking Without the Censor and the Censor Hollow Without the Catechism; Why the Interpreter Class Is the Supreme Prize Because It Sits on Both Valves at Once; Why Each Valve Runs on a Dial From the Coordination No Society Can Do Without to the Domination That Merely Rules; and Why the Freedom Worth Defending Is Therefore Two Freedoms, the Plural Formation That No One Hand May Own and the Free Circulation That No One Hand May Seal — A Study of the Gates

Thomas J. Bryan

with Claude (Anthropic)

Patterns of Power · 2026

Preface

❧

This study isolates the mechanism of information control and finds that it has two operations, not one. The premise is plain to the point of being easy to miss: a person can act only on the information in their own head, so whoever would govern the action must govern the head — and there are exactly two ways to do it. One can fill the head with the chosen story, the catechism poured in early by the means of formation until it is simply the furniture of the person's world; this is the inflow. Or one can keep the rival story out, by the censor's list, the sealed archive, the cost raised on knowing, the signal drowned in noise; this is the outflow. The two valves answer to a single logic, because a mind decides on its contents and its contents may be governed from either direction — by what is admitted and by what is barred.

The study is the companion to one that came before it, which argued that the deep technology of rule is information asymmetry — the elite's claim to know what the population cannot check — and that the seat of that asymmetry is the interpreter class, the priests and scholars and experts the collection calls the seam of the whole structure. This study opens that seat and finds the two valves inside it, for the interpreter class is the one organ of an order that works both at once: it authors the inflow, writing the catechism and setting the curriculum, and it adjudicates the outflow, declaring the heresy and defining the forbidden. That is why its capture is worth more than the sword or the treasury — it is the single seat that fills and starves the governed mind together.

The argument keeps the collection's discipline against cynicism. Neither valve is sinister in itself: a society must form its young, and may rightly keep some things out, so the question is never whether to work the valves but how. Each runs on a dial, from the coordination no society can do without to the domination that merely rules — an education or an indoctrination, a protection or a suppression — and the freedom worth defending is therefore two freedoms, a plural formation that no one hand may own and a free circulation that no one hand may seal. The study ends by naming the danger that wears the costume of liberation: the demand to tear down all formation and distrust all information, which is not the opening of the mind but the supreme move to clear both valves for a single new pipe. *Tested, never revealed.*

A Note on This Collaboration

❧

This study, like the rest of the collection, is a collaboration between a human author and an artificial intelligence. The governing intuition is Thomas J. Bryan's, and it arrived in the plain form that the best of these insights take: that a person decides only on what is in their head, so that *if I can control your information, I can control you* — and that those in power are therefore always seen doing two things, controlling the pipelines that pour information in (the means of formation) and working to keep rival information out. Those two observations, set side by side, are the inflow and the outflow of this study, and the recognition that a single class — the interpreter class of the companion volume — sits on both at once is the spine of the argument.

The framing that results, the marshalling of the scholarship of formation and of censorship, the verification, and the writing are Claude's (Anthropic), developed in dialogue with the author and to the project's standing rules. The study brackets the truth of every faith and ideology it treats, asking only how belief functions and never whether it is true; it analyses structure rather than character; it credits the coordinative face of formation and secrecy as readily as it names the parasitic; it turns its own theory upon its own author, holding that a study of the valves which imagined itself above the valves would be the thing it warns against; and where it draws on the collection's other volumes it describes the dynamic it is borrowing, so that the study stands on its own.

The Argument in Seven Parts

❧

The study, in six parts, runs as follows.

Part I — The Two Ways to Govern a Mind. The premise and the pair: a person acts only on the contents of their head, so a mind is governed either by filling it or by starving it; the inflow of formation and the outflow of suppression as a matched pair worked, in every durable order, by a single class — with the discipline that each valve has a coordinative face and neither is sinister in itself.

Part II — The Inflow: Filling the Head. The inflow valve, formation: the pouring of the authorized story into a mind before it can be weighed, by the school and church and press a society least suspects; how Althusser's ideological apparatus and Bourdieu's symbolic violence and the modern theorists of propaganda describe it; and why what is poured in is experienced not as control but as one's own mind.

Part III — The Outflow: Starving the Head. The outflow valve, suppression: the censor's list and the sealed door and the surveillance that must see in order to bar; how the modern forms are less the crude deletion of fear than the friction that raises the cost of knowing and the flooding that drowns the rival; and why the true target is not opinion but coordination, the shared picture that lets the many act as one.

Part IV — Why You Need Both. Why a lasting order needs both: the catechism leaks without the censor, as a formation poured into open heads is overtaken by the rival that reaches them; the censor is hollow without the catechism, as suppression with nothing to install holds only a vacuum by force; and the fusion moves, from the sealed canon to the ministry of truth, that work both valves at a stroke.

Part V — The Double Valve: Why the Interpreter Class Is the Prize. Why the interpreter class is the prize: not for the sword or the treasury, which it lacks, but because it is the one seat that works both valves at once; the measured lever that lets it bend the rule it transmits; and why the apparatus runs whether or not its keepers believe what they say, because the leverage was never in their sincerity but in the gap.

Part VI — The Dial, and the Two Freedoms. Why neither valve can be abolished, so the question is how; the dial each runs, from the coordination a society cannot do without to the domination that merely rules; and the answer — two freedoms, a plural formation no single hand may own and a free circulation no single hand may seal, against both the sealed channel and the cleared ground that wears the costume of liberation.

Part I

The Two Ways to Govern a Mind

The premise from which the whole study follows — that a person can act only on the information in their own head, so that whoever would govern the action must govern the head; that there are exactly two ways to do it, to fill the head with what one chooses and to keep out what one fears; and that these two operations, the inflow of formation and the outflow of suppression, are a matched pair worked, in every durable order, by a single class

I. Decisions Are Made on the Contents of the Head

Begin with a fact so plain it is easy to walk past, though everything in this study follows from it: a person can decide only on the information in their own head. Whatever a man knows, believes, values, or fears is the whole of the material from which his choices are built, and he cannot weigh a consideration that never reached him, nor doubt a claim he never learned was doubtable, nor want a thing he was never given to imagine. The collection from which this study comes models every person as a calculator of expected benefit against expected cost, reasoning soundly from their own position — what it calls *position logic*, the reason people in like situations act alike without any conspiracy among them — and it locates the leverage in two settings it calls the dials: the first being what a person counts as a benefit, which is installed in them early by others before they could weigh it, and the second being whether a cost is real, which depends on whether anyone is actually keeping account. Both dials are set from the contents of the head. Fill a person's head with the values that make an arrangement feel like their own, and the first dial is turned; fill it with the belief that deviation will surely be caught and punished, and the second is turned. The head is where rule is cheapest to apply, because a person governed through the contents of their own mind experiences the government as their own judgement and supplies the compliance themselves.

It follows that whoever would govern the decision must govern the head, and that there are exactly two ways to do it, which is the whole subject of this study. One can put things in, and one can keep things out. One can fill the head with the chosen story — the catechism, the curriculum, the authorized account — poured in early and often until it is simply the furniture of the person's world; this is the inflow, and the institutions that perform it are the means of formation. Or one can keep out the rival story — the heresy, the inconvenient fact, the competing account — by censoring it, sealing it, drowning it, or making it too costly to reach; this is the outflow, and the institutions that perform it are the apparatus of suppression. These are the two valves on the channel of a mind, and they answer to a single logic, because a person decides on what is in their head and you may control what is in their head from either direction — by what you admit and by what you bar. The street-corner version of the whole matter, which is also the truest, is that it is not what you know that gives another power over you; it is what you do not know, and there are two ways to keep you from knowing: pour your head full of something else, or wall the something off.

II. One Class, Two Valves

This study is the companion to one that came before it in the collection, and a word on the relation will orient the reader, because the prior study established the ground this one builds on. That study argued that the deep technology of rule is information asymmetry — the elite's claim to know what the population cannot check — and that the seat of the asymmetry is the interpreter class, the priests and scholars and experts who claim the special knowledge needed to read the sacred thing and whom the collection calls the seam of the whole structure, the joint at which a doctrine is translated into the obligations of the present. It showed that this asymmetry cannot be abolished, because no one in a complex society can verify more than a sliver of what they believe, so that depending on knowers one cannot check is permanent, the cognitive face of the division of labor; and that the asymmetry runs on a dial from the coordinative kind a society needs to the parasitic kind that merely dominates. The present study opens that seat and looks at the machinery inside it, and finds the two valves. For the interpreter class does not perform one operation but two: it authors and transmits the inflow — it writes the catechism, sets the curriculum, keeps the canon — and it adjudicates the outflow — it declares the heresy, defines the forbidden, certifies what may be known. The reason capturing the interpreter class is the

supreme move in the whole repertoire of power, worth more than the sword or the treasury, is that it is the one seat that works both valves at once, filling and starving the minds of the governed with a single hand.

One discipline must be set at the outset, because without it this study would collapse into the cheap cynicism the collection refuses, the reflex that sees every school as a mill of lies and every secret as a crime. Both valves have a face that is not domination at all but the ordinary machinery by which any society lives. You cannot raise a child with no formation; the inflow is how a culture transmits itself, how arithmetic and language and the accumulated craft of generations are poured into a new mind that could not reinvent them alone, and a person formed in nothing is not free but feral. And some suppression is mere prudence; the design of a weapon, the private medical record, the position of the fleet in wartime, the libel and the fraud are kept out of circulation by orders no reasonable person calls tyrannical. So neither valve is sinister in itself. Each runs, as the prior study found of the asymmetry as a whole, on a dial — from the coordination no society can do without to the domination that merely rules — and the work of this study is not to denounce the valves, which cannot be removed, but to anatomize them, to show how a durable order works both, and to find the conditions under which they serve the governed rather than only the governors. The two parts that follow take the valves one at a time.

Part II

The Inflow: Filling the Head

The first valve, formation — the pouring of the authorized story into a mind before it can be weighed, by the institutions a society least suspects of doing it; how the school and the church and the press form the subject and render their content obvious rather than arguable; how the modern theorists of propaganda described the same valve at industrial scale; and why what is poured in is experienced not as control but as one's own mind, which is the source of its power

I. The Apparatus That Forms

The first valve is formation, and its signature is that it does not feel like control, because what it installs arrives before the person is able to recognise it as installed. The philosopher Louis Althusser drew the distinction that organises this whole part. He observed that a ruling order disposes of two kinds of apparatus: a repressive apparatus — the police, the army, the prison — that works by force and shows itself only at the margins, and an ideological apparatus — the school, the church, the family, the media — that works not by force but by formation, and is so woven into ordinary life that no one experiences it as an instrument of rule at all. He called the second the ideological state apparatus, and argued that it does the deeper work, because it produces the subjects who believe their own position to be natural and right; and he gave the school pride of place, on the ground that it holds the captive attention of the young in what is taken to be a neutral setting, so that the content it transmits is received not as one contestable account among others but as simply the way things are. He called the process by which the apparatus makes a person into a subject *interpellation* — a hailing, a calling-into-place — and its mark is exactly that the formed person mistakes the call for their own voice. This is the inflow valve named with precision, and it maps onto the collection's own architecture without remainder: Althusser's repressive apparatus is the floor of force, and his ideological apparatus is the means of formation that sets the first dial, the one that fills a person's sense of what is good before they can weigh it.

The sociologist Pierre Bourdieu deepened the account by attending to what Althusser passed over, the bodily and unconscious depth at which formation lodges. Bourdieu's term *symbolic violence* names a domination that is not felt as violence at all because the dominated have been formed to accept the very standards by which their domination is justified — the imposition experienced as legitimate, even as natural, by the person it subordinates. The school, in his analysis, reproduces the existing order not mainly by teaching facts but by inculcating dispositions, a whole embodied sense of what is proper and possible and one's due, which he called the *habitus*; and because this sense is laid down below the level of conscious thought, it is defended as if it were the self, not argued for as if it were a claim. What both thinkers saw, from their different angles, is the property that makes the inflow valve so much more powerful and so much cheaper than the outflow: the catechism poured in early is not held as a belief that might be false but lived as the shape of reality, so that it requires no enforcement, reproduces itself for free as each formed generation forms the next, and is experienced by its bearer not as something done to them but as their own mind. The collection has made the same observation in its own voice, that the loaded text written by an old apex is inherited by later generations not as the work of a faction but as the word of God or the order of nature, and that this forgetting is what makes an arrangement cheapest of all to hold.

II. The Valve at Industrial Scale

The modern era did not abolish the inflow valve; it industrialised it, and a lineage of theorists tracked the change. The journalist Walter Lippmann, writing in 1922 out of his experience watching opinion produced to order during the First World War, argued that the citizen of a mass society cannot know the vast world directly and so lives instead in a *pseudo-environment* — a furnished interior of stereotypes and simplified pictures, assembled for him by others, on which he acts as though it were the world itself. From this he drew the phrase that named the valve for the century, the *manufacture of consent*, and — a point this study will need when it reaches the dial — he did not think it simply sinister, holding that some management of a public too large and busy to master every question was a necessity of complex government, to be performed by a competent class. His nephew-in-trade Edward Bernays took the diagnosis and made it a profession, naming his technique the *engineering of consent* and showing how mass opinion could be moved by the association of symbols and the

staging of events, methods that passed without friction from selling soap to selling wars. The theologian and critic Jacques Ellul, studying the mature form, argued that the deepest propaganda is not the crude lie but the slow formation of attitudes, a total environment that integrates the individual into the mass and works most thoroughly on those who think themselves immune. And the analysts Edward Herman and Noam Chomsky, in 1988, gave the valve a mechanism for a nominally free press, describing a model in which ownership, advertising, official sourcing, organised complaint, and a mobilising enemy act as filters that shape what is reported without any need for overt command — consent manufactured, in their phrase, by market forces and internalised assumption and self-censorship rather than by force.

What this lineage establishes is that the inflow valve does not require a ministry or a censor or any visible act of control; it can run through the ordinary, dispersed, and largely sincere operation of a society's formative institutions, which is precisely why it is so hard to see and so easy to deny. And the valve builds not only beliefs but peoples. The historian Eugen Weber showed how the France of the late nineteenth century turned its regional, dialect-speaking, locally-loyal peasants into national French citizens within a couple of generations, not by force but through the schoolroom and the conscript's barracks and the railway and the standard tongue — a whole apparatus of formation that poured a national self into populations that had not previously possessed one. The lesson for this study is that the inflow valve reaches all the way down to the contents of identity itself: it sets not merely what a person believes about the world but what a person takes themselves to be, and a self formed by an apparatus will defend that apparatus as it defends itself, which is the deepest compliance there is and the cheapest to keep. But formation alone, however deep, is never quite enough, because a head being filled with one story can always be reached by another — which is the work of the second valve.

Part III

The Outflow: Starving the Head

The second valve, suppression — the keeping-out of the rival story by the censor's list, the sealed archive, and the surveillance that must see in order to bar; how the modern forms are not the crude deletion of fear but the subtler friction that raises the cost of knowing and the flooding that drowns the rival in noise; why the true target of the outflow valve is not opinion but coordination, the shared picture that would let the many act as one; and how the valve differs from its twin in being defensive, costly, and resented

I. The Censor and the Sealed Door

If the inflow valve fills the head, the outflow valve guards it, and its history is the history of the censor. The archetype is the list of forbidden books — most famously the Roman Catholic Index Librorum Prohibitorum, first issued in 1559 to stem the spread of Reformation writing and not abandoned until 1966, four centuries during which an office of official censors named the works a faithful person might not read, from the treatises of Hume and Hobbes and Kant and Descartes to particular books of Milton and Pascal, and required that others be expurgated, their offending passages struck out before the rest could pass. One provision of that first Index is worth pausing on, because it shows the outflow valve serving the interpreter monopoly directly: it forbade the Bible in the common tongue, keeping the sacred text out of the hands of the laity so that only the licensed interpreters could say what it contained — suppression deployed not against error but against the people's unmediated access to the very thing they were formed to revere. Against this stands the founding statement of the case for the open channel, John Milton's Areopagitica of 1644, written against a parliamentary order that required every book to pass a censor before it could be printed; Milton's argument was that licensing before publication is not the prevention of error but the state's seizure of thought itself, and it became the seed of the modern doctrine that the remedy for a bad idea is a better one rather than a ban.

The outflow valve has a third arm that the censor's list makes easy to forget: to bar what it must not admit, the apparatus must first see. Suppression depends on detection, and detection depends on surveillance, so the closed archive and the watched correspondence and the monitored gathering are not separate from censorship but its necessary eyes. The collection's study of opacity drew the asymmetry exactly: a durable order arranges to see its population while remaining itself unseen, knowing each subject's holdings and movements while keeping its own deliberations sealed — and that double arrangement is the outflow valve in full, the population's information about the rulers kept out while the rulers' information about the population is poured in. The two directions of sight are one mechanism. What the order keeps from the governed and what it gathers about them are the same valve worked from both sides, and the sealed door and the open file are cut from a single design.

II. Friction, Flooding, and the Real Target

The modern study of suppression has overturned the crude picture in which censorship means deletion backed by fear, and the correction matters because it reveals what the valve is really for. The political scientist Margaret Roberts, studying the largest information-control apparatus ever built, distinguished three mechanisms. The first is *fear* — the threat of punishment that deters a person from seeking or spreading what is forbidden — and it is the oldest and crudest, but also the most expensive and the most prone to backfire, since visible repression advertises the thing it suppresses and provokes the resentment the collection has shown force always breeds. The second is *friction* — not forbidding the rival information but raising the cost of reaching it, slowing it, blocking the convenient path, removing the search term, so that the determined few still get through while the busy many, who will not pay the added cost, drift toward the easy and approved. The third is *flooding* — not removing the rival signal but drowning it, pouring out so much distraction and noise and manufactured consensus that the rival cannot be found in the deluge or cannot be told from its counterfeits. The deep finding is that the modern apparatus prefers the second and third to the first, because friction and flooding are porous and quiet and do not look like censorship at all, and so achieve the suppression without paying the cost of visible repression.

This reframing exposes the true target of the outflow valve, and it is not what the older picture supposed. Research on the same apparatus found that it permitted a great deal of ordinary criticism of the rulers and their

policies while moving with speed and force against something quite different: any information carrying the potential to *coordinate* — to bring people together, to call a gathering, to turn scattered private discontent into joint public action. The target is not opinion but coordination, and this returns the whole study to the arithmetic with which the collection begins. The many can overcome the few only by acting together, and acting together requires a shared picture — a common knowledge of the grievance, the moment, the others who will also act. The outflow valve exists to deny the many that shared picture: to keep each subject uncertain whether their discontent is private or general, whether the others will rise or stay home, so that the coordination which is the only real threat to the few never assembles. Where the floor of force established that the many cannot simply leave, the outflow valve establishes that the many cannot easily combine, because they are kept from the shared knowledge that combination requires. And here the two valves show their difference in character: the inflow is constructive, cheap, slow, invisible, and self-reproducing, a thing poured in once and thereafter held as one's own; the outflow is defensive, costly, never finished, and resented, a wall that must be patrolled forever against a rival information that is always trying to seep through. The inflow builds the self; the outflow merely guards it. Which is why no durable order can rely on either alone.

Part IV

Why You Need Both

That the two valves are a matched pair and a lasting order works them together — the catechism leaking without the censor, as a formation poured into open heads is overtaken by the rival story that reaches them; the censor hollow without the catechism, as a suppression with nothing positive to install holds only a vacuum by force; and the fusion moves, from the sealed canon to the ministry of truth, in which a single stroke both fixes what may be poured in and bars what may be kept out

I. The Catechism Leaks; The Censor Is Hollow

A formation poured into open heads does not hold, because a head that has received one story can always receive another, and the rival story, if it is allowed to circulate, will compete with the catechism on its own ground and in some heads will win. This is why the inflow valve alone is insufficient and why the most confident formation in the world still reaches for the censor: the catechism leaks unless the heresy is kept out. The history of every established doctrine is in part the history of its alarm at competitors, and the alarm is not mainly theological but structural, for a rival account freely circulating is a standing demonstration that the official account is one option among others rather than the shape of reality — which is the one thing the inflow valve cannot survive being known. So the order that forms must also suppress, not because its formation is weak but because no formation is total, and the gaps the inflow leaves are exactly what the outflow exists to seal.

The reverse dependence is just as strict, and less often noticed: suppression with nothing to put in the cleared space is brittle and expensive and tends not to last. A censor who bars every rival but offers no positive account holds only a vacuum, and a vacuum in the head is unstable, because the human mind does not rest empty but reaches for whatever story is available, including the forbidden one precisely because it is forbidden; pure suppression, moreover, must be enforced continually and against everyone, which is the warlord's information regime, costly and hollow and quick to provoke the backlash that visible repression always courts. The outflow valve is cheap and durable only when it guards a catechism the population already holds and wants to keep, so that the people themselves resent the heresy and help to keep it out, their suppression of the rival experienced not as obedience but as the defence of what they love. Suppression works best as the servant of formation: the wall matters only because there is something inside worth walling, and the something inside endures only because the wall keeps the competitors off it. Neither valve is sufficient; each needs the other; and the durable order is the one that pours in the catechism and keeps out the heresy at once, the two operations braced against each other into a single self-supporting structure.

II. The Fusion Moves

The clearest sign that the two valves are one mechanism is that the most powerful instruments of information control work both at a single stroke. The collection's prior study examined one such instrument at length: the sealing of a revealed channel, the doctrine that prophecy has ended and the canon is closed and the current text is the last. Read as information control, the seal is a perfect fusion of the valves. It fixes the inflow — this canon and no other is the authorized deposit, the only thing that may be poured into the faithful — and in the same motion it bars the outflow — no new revelation may enter, no fresh claimant may reopen the channel, every future word from outside is false by definition. One doctrine both sets what may be installed and forbids what may compete, which is why the sealed canon is among the most durable structures the history of belief records: it works both valves with one rule and needs no further act.

The modern imagination supplied the same fusion in a sharper image. The novelist George Orwell, anatomising the total information state, gave it a Ministry of Truth that did two things which are the two valves exactly. It practised what he called Newspeak — the deliberate narrowing of language itself, the removal of the very words in which a forbidden thought could be formed, so that the rival idea became not merely punishable but unthinkable; this is the inflow valve driven to its root, formation reaching down to shape the instrument of thought before any particular thought occurs. And it operated the memory hole — the continual deletion and rewriting of the record, so that no inconvenient fact survived to be retrieved; this is the outflow valve at its most thorough, suppression reaching back to unmake the past itself. The image is fiction, but the structure is

exact, and the real instruments approximate it: the propaganda model the analysts described both selects what shall be amplified and marginalises what shall be heard as dissent; the modern apparatus of friction and flooding both drowns the rival in the order's preferred noise and pours that noise in as the approved account, so that the same operation suppresses and forms in one act. The lesson is that the two valves, separable in analysis, are in practice the two faces of a single thing, and that whoever holds the instrument that works both at once holds the contents of the governed mind from both directions — which is the seat the next part names.

Part V

The Double Valve: Why the Interpreter Class Is the Prize

Why the interpreter class is the supreme object of capture in any order — not because it holds the sword or the treasury, which it does not, but because it is the one seat that works both valves at once, authoring the inflow and adjudicating the outflow; how the lever the laboratory has measured lets it bend the rule it transmits; and why the whole apparatus runs regardless of whether the people who staff it believe what they say, because the leverage was never in their sincerity but in the gap

I. The Seat That Fills and Starves

The interpreter class — the priesthood, the scholars, the licensed experts, the keepers of the canon and the curriculum and the official record — holds neither the sword nor the purse, and a superficial view of power therefore underrates it. But it sits, alone among the organs of an order, on both valves of the governed mind at once, and that is why its capture is the supreme prize. It authors and transmits the inflow: it writes the catechism and sets the syllabus, decides which texts are sacred and which readings are sound, forms the young and certifies the teachers who form the next young, and so controls what is poured into the population's heads. And it adjudicates the outflow: it names the heresy and defines the forbidden, declares which claims are beyond the pale and which questions may not be asked, certifies what counts as knowledge and what is to be dismissed, and so controls what is kept out of the population's heads. One seat, both directions. The holder of the sword can kill a man but cannot fill his head; the holder of the treasury can buy a man but cannot form his child; the interpreter class does both the filling and the keeping-out, and does them not for one generation but across the generations, which is why every contest for a durable order's commanding height is, sooner or later, a contest for its interpreter class — and why the rulers who hold the sword are so anxious to own it, and so dangerous when they do, for the order whose single class controls both valves under one hand has closed the governed mind from every side.

The prior study described the lever that makes this seat not merely a transmitter but an active instrument of rule, and it bears restating here because it is what lets the interpreter work the inflow valve in real time. The psychologist Philip Tetlock found, studying the values people hold sacred, that a rule struck raw is rigid and vengeful — name a forbidden trade-off plainly and people recoil and want to punish whoever proposed it — but that the identical rule, when rhetorically reframed as a tragic necessity or as the service of some higher sacred end, is accepted by many who would have been outraged by the plain version. The moral boundary is rigid for whoever hears the rule raw and supple for whoever controls the reframing. That asymmetry is the interpreter's whole working lever on the inflow valve: the commoner, hearing the rule raw, is bound by it absolutely and enforces it on himself and his neighbours; the interpreter, who controls the reframing, can find the reading that grants the powerful the exception the commoner is denied, and pour that reframed rule back into the population as the rule's truer meaning. He does not change what is sacred; he changes what the sacred is taken to require — which is to re-pour the inflow without ever appearing to touch it. And the outflow he works by the plainer instrument of the anathema: the rival reading is named heresy and kept out. The same seat, bending what comes in and barring what would compete.

II. The Gap, Not the Motive

A final property of the double valve must be stated because it is the one most often misunderstood, and the prior study established it as a discipline this one inherits: the apparatus runs regardless of whether the people who staff it believe what they say. It is tempting to imagine the interpreter as a cynic who knows the catechism is a tool and the heresy a rival, and some are; but most are not, and the structure does not require that any be. The teacher who pours the formation into the young mostly believes it, having had it poured into her; she transmits the catechism as truth because to her it is truth, and her sincerity makes her more effective, not less, because a believed formation is transmitted with a conviction no cynic could fake. The censor who keeps out the heresy mostly believes he is protecting the people from error, not guarding a monopoly; his conscience is clear, and the clear conscience is precisely what lets him do the work tirelessly. The leverage of the whole apparatus was never in the operator's dishonesty. It was in the gap — in the fact that the population cannot check the claim and must take it from the marked source — and the gap is exactly as wide whether the source

is lying or sincere. The street-corner statement of the matter cuts to it cleanly: the power of the one who says he speaks for God lies not in whether he is lying about it but in the fact that you cannot tell, and he may believe it himself with his whole heart, and it changes nothing, because what governs you is not his insincerity but your inability to verify. The valves run on the gap, not the motive — which is why the remedy, when the study reaches it, cannot be the exposure of insincere interpreters, of whom there are fewer than the cynic supposes, but must be something structural: the keeping-open of the gap itself, so that no single sincere or insincere hand can fill and starve the governed mind alone.

Part VI

The Dial, and the Two Freedoms

Why neither valve can be abolished, since a society must form its young and may rightly keep some things out, so that the question is never whether to work the valves but how; the dial on which each runs, from the coordination a society cannot do without to the domination that merely rules; and the answer the whole study points to — that the freedom worth defending is two freedoms, a plural formation that no single hand may own and a free circulation that no single hand may seal, with the populist demand to tear down all formation and distrust all information exposed as the supreme move to work both valves from one pipe

I. The Dial on Each Valve

Neither valve can be abolished, and a study that ended in the demand to abolish them would have learned nothing from the collection it belongs to, which has shown across every volume that the apparatus of an advanced society cannot be torn out without burying the population in the rubble. The inflow valve cannot be removed because a society must form its young; a child poured full of nothing is not a free spirit but a ruin, and the transmission of language and number and the accumulated craft of the species is the inflow valve doing the work without which there is no civilisation at all. The outflow valve cannot be removed because some information may rightly be kept out of circulation; the design of the weapon, the name of the informant, the private record, the deliberate lie crafted to defraud — a society that could keep nothing out would be at the mercy of its worst actors. So the valves are permanent, and the question is never whether to work them but how, and the how is a dial — the same dial the prior study found running beneath the whole asymmetry, from the coordinative pole at which the operation serves the governed to the parasitic pole at which it merely rules them.

The tests that locate each valve on the dial are reasonably clear, and they are the heart of what this study has to offer anyone trying to tell the formation that frees from the formation that enslaves, or the secrecy that protects from the secrecy that dominates. The inflow valve sits near the coordinative pole when the formation is plural and contestable and forms the young to question — when there are many sources and rival accounts and the explicit teaching that the received story may be doubted and tested — and it slides toward the parasitic pole as it becomes monopolised and closed and forms the young to obey, a single account from a single source with doubt itself marked as deviance, which is the exact difference between an education and an indoctrination though the two can look alike from outside. The outflow valve sits near the coordinative pole when what is kept out is genuinely harmful or private and the keeping-out is done by accountable institutions that can themselves be checked and challenged — when the secret is justified to someone and the justification can be contested — and it slides toward the parasitic pole as it becomes the suppression of rival truth and inconvenient fact by the powerful to protect their own position, secrecy that serves the keeper rather than the kept, censorship of the account that would embarrass rather than the account that would harm. Neither valve is condemned by its existence; each is judged by where on the dial it sits, and the same society runs some of each at both poles at once, which is why the work is never a verdict but always a measurement.

II. The Two Freedoms, and the Cleared Ground

What follows is the answer the whole study points toward, and it is two freedoms, not one, because there are two valves and each must be guarded against a single hand. Against the capture of the inflow valve, the freedom that matters is the plurality of formation — that no one hand may own the means by which a population's heads are filled, no monopoly on the school and the press and the story, so that the first dial cannot be set for everyone from a single point and the young are formed by enough rival sources that they learn the received account is an account. Against the capture of the outflow valve, the freedom that matters is the free circulation of information — the liberty to publish and to read, the press that cannot be licensed, the archive that can be opened, the right to know what is done in one's name, the rival voice protected precisely because it is the rival, so that no one hand may seal the channel against what it fears. These are distinct freedoms guarding distinct valves, and seeing them as two clarifies what a free order is actually for: it protects the right to speak and publish against those who would work the outflow valve, and it resists the monopoly over school and media and story of those who would work the inflow valve, and it needs both protections because an order that secured only one would leave the other valve open to a single hand. And beneath both

stands the structural safeguard the prior study named — the interpreter class kept plural and contestable, rival schools and competing experts and independent readers permitted, so that no single class can sit on both valves at once and fill and starve the governed mind from one seat.

Two dangers stand against this answer, and the study ends by naming them at full strength, for a study of the valves that imagined itself above the valves would be the thing it warns of. The first is the obvious one, the sealed channel of the priest and the censor, the single hand that pours in one catechism and walls out every heresy — the danger the whole collection has tracked, monopoly over the governed mind, and against it the two freedoms are the standing defence. But the second danger is subtler and wears the costume of liberation, and it has grown as the channels of information have multiplied: it is the demand to tear down all formation as indoctrination and to distrust all information as a lie — to declare that the schools only brainwash and the press only deceives and the experts only serve themselves, and that the people should therefore trust none of them. This sounds like the freeing of the mind, and it is the opposite, for it is the supreme move to work both valves from a single pipe. To discredit every existing source of formation is to clear the inflow valve of all competitors; to teach that all information is a lie is to seal the outflow valve against every rival account; and into the cleared and sealed space a single new voice — the leader, the movement, the channel that claims to speak the people's truth directly against a world of liars — can pour its catechism alone and bar every heresy as just one more lie of the discredited old order. It is the firehose disguised as the open tap, the monopoly advancing under the banner of anti-monopoly, the closing of the governed mind performed as its liberation. Against both the sealed channel and the cleared ground the study holds its one position, which is the collection's: the valves are permanent, the danger is permanent, and the only freedom available is not to abolish the valves, which cannot be done, but to keep both of them open to many hands — to refuse equally the priest who would fill and wall the mind and the demagogue who would empty it only to fill it himself, and to do, in every generation and without the hope of finishing, the unglamorous work of keeping more than one hand on each valve of the governed mind. Tested, never revealed: it was never what you know that gave another power over you, but what you do not, and the two ways to keep you from knowing are to fill your head with their story and to wall away the rest — so the whole of freedom, on this one axis, is to keep both the filling and the walling in more hands than one.

A Note on Sources

❧

This study is a work of synthesis; it rests its load-bearing claims on standard scholarship, brackets the truth of every faith and ideology it treats, and asks only how belief functions. Quotations are avoided in favour of paraphrase.

The theory of the inflow valve — formation — follows the canonical accounts. The distinction between a repressive apparatus that works by force and an ideological apparatus (school, church, family, media) that works by formation, together with the concept of interpellation, follows Louis Althusser, “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses” (1970). The account of symbolic violence and the habitus, of domination misrecognised as legitimate by the dominated, follows Pierre Bourdieu, with Jean-Claude Passeron, *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* (1970). The industrial-scale theorists of formation are Walter Lippmann, *Public Opinion* (1922), for the pseudo-environment and the “manufacture of consent,” which he judged in part a necessity; Edward Bernays, *Propaganda* (1928), for the “engineering of consent”; Jacques Ellul, *Propaganda* (1965), for propaganda as the formation of attitudes; and Edward Herman and Noam Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* (1988), for the propaganda model of filters operating “without overt coercion.” The formation of a national people through schooling and conscription follows Eugen Weber, *Peasants into Frenchmen* (1976).

The theory of the outflow valve — suppression — rests on the history and the modern study of censorship. The Roman Catholic Index Librorum Prohibitorum (first official edition 1559, discontinued 1966), the office of the censor, the practice of expurgation, and the prohibition of the vernacular Bible follow the standard accounts; the founding argument against pre-publication licensing is John Milton's *Areopagitica* (1644). The modern mechanisms — fear, friction, and flooding, and the finding that porous censorship prefers friction and flooding to visible repression — follow Margaret Roberts, *Censored: Distraction and Diversion Inside China's Great Firewall* (2018); the finding that information control targets the potential for collective action rather than criticism as such follows Gary King, Jennifer Pan, and Margaret Roberts (2013). The detection arm of suppression, the order that sees its population while remaining itself unseen, connects to the collection's study of opacity. The fusion of the valves in a single instrument is illustrated by the doctrine of the sealed canon, treated at length in the companion volume, and by George Orwell's Newspeak and memory hole (1949), used as illustration.

The framework's terms — the floor of force and the two dials of position logic, the interpreter class as the seam, the cognitive architecture that makes deference reliable, the information asymmetry whose master account is the companion study, the factual and evaluative layers, the parasite-and-metabolism ratio, and the institutional friction that keeps the dials costly to set from one hand — are developed across the collection's companion studies, in particular *The Division of Knowing*, to which this is the direct companion, together with *The Machine That Runs Itself*, the synthesis *The Machine That Outlasts Its Builders*, and *The Opacity of Power*; each dynamic borrowed here is described in the text so that this study stands alone. *Part of the collection* Patterns of Power. *Tested, never revealed.*